

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 8-20, and 22-25 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 23 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims.

Claims 1-5, 8, 15-20, 22-23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,852,434 to Sekendur ("Sekendur") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,348,914 to Tuli ("Tuli").

Independent claim 1 is directed to an electronic reading device. The Examiner concedes that Sekendur does not disclose a sensor for detecting a contact between an electronic reading device and a specially formatted surface. Tuli has been cited by the Examiner as teaching an electronic pen device comprising a pressure sensor for detecting a contact between the electronic pen device and a writing surface. In Tuli, a pressure sensor detects the contact or non-contact of a pen against a writing medium. The sensor as disclosed in Tuli detects a condition that handwriting is occurring only when the user presses the pen against the writing medium.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sekendur and Tuli fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 1, namely, detection of contact between an electronic reading device and a specially formatted surface greater than a predetermined threshold force, the predetermined threshold force being greater than a force present when the electronic reading device initially comes into contact with the specially formatted surface. Applicant respectfully submits that

amended independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited combination of Sekendur and Tuli.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-5 and 25 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-5 and 25 distinguish over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent claims 2-5 and 25 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 is directed to a system for electronic entry of information. The Examiner concedes that Sekendur does not disclose a sensor for detecting a contact between an electronic reading device and a specially formatted surface. Tuli has been cited by the Examiner as teaching an electronic pen device comprising a pressure sensor for detecting a contact between the electronic pen device and a writing surface.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sekendur and Tuli fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 8, namely, a sensor for detecting contact between a tip of an electronic reading device and a specially formatted surface greater than a predetermined threshold force, the predetermined threshold force being greater than a force present when the electronic reading device initially comes into contact with the specially formatted surface. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 distinguishes over the cited combination of Sekendur and Tuli. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a method for using an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sekendur and Tuli fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 15, namely, selecting a particular location on a specially formatted surface by pressing the electronic

reading device against the specially formatted surface above a predetermined threshold force, the predetermined threshold force being greater than a force present when an electronic reading device initially comes into contact with the specially formatted surface. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 distinguishes over the cited combination of Sekendur and Tuli. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 16-20 and 22 depend from and further limit independent claim 15 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 15, dependent claims 16-20 and 22 distinguish over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent claims 16-20 and 22 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 23 is directed to an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sekendur and Tuli fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 23, namely, detection of contact between the electronic reading device and a specially formatted surface greater than a predetermined threshold force, the predetermined threshold force being greater than a force present when the electronic reading device initially comes into contact with the specially formatted surface. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 23 distinguishes over the cited combination of Sekendur and Tuli. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 23 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-14 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekendur in view of Tuli as applied to claims 1-5, 8, 15-20, 22-23, and 25 above, and further in view of GB 2306669 to Wolff et al. ("Wolff").

Dependent claims 9-14 depend from and further limit independent claim 8 in a patentable sense. Dependent claim 24 depends from and further limits independent claim 23 in a

patentable sense. Wolff fails to supply the deficiencies of Sekendur and Tuli noted above with respect to claims 8 and 23, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 8 and 23, respectively, dependent claims 9-14 and 24 distinguish over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent claims 9-14 and 24 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: Nov. 26, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Ross T. Robinson

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

(214) 855-4300 (Fax)